S 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDANTS						
DAVID A. MAESTAS	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.						
(b) County of Residence		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant					
, ,	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	iress)	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.				
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman,			2/410				
30 E. Butler Pike	P.C.		Attorneys (If Known)				
Ambler, PA 19002							
(215) 540-8888		0					
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF I		L PARTIES	Place an "X" in Or and One Box for	
D I U.S. Government	☑ 3 Federal Question			TF DEF			PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Cítizo	en of This State C	); <u>(</u> );	Incorporated or Pri of Business In This		57 4 D74
☐ 2 U.S. Government	O 4 Diversity	Citiza	en of Another State C	0 2 0 2	Incorporated and P	Principal Place	0 S 0 S
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				of Business In A		
			en or Subject of a Creign Country	3 (3) 3	Foreign Nation		O 6 O 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)						
	TORTS	SECTO	RESTUREMENAUTY	e seemesban	KRUPTOV	OTHERS	STATUTES SCHARE
C 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		0 Agriculture		al 28 USC 158	(J 400 State Rea	ipportionment
C 120 Marine C 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane		0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure	(D) 423 Wided		O 410 Antitrust	
D 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability (7 365 Personal Injury		of Property 21 USC 881	28 03	SC 157	<ul> <li>430 Banks an</li> <li>450 Comment</li> </ul>	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	C 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability		0 Liquor Laws		TY-RIGHTS		
& Enforcement of Judgment			0 R.R. & Truck	(1) 820 Соруг		O 470 Racketee	
D 151 Medicare Act D 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Injury Product     Liability Liability		0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational	330 Patent 3 840 Trade		Corrupt C	Organizations
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	rty 🗀 🐃	Safety/Health	S 540 11au	ning K	O 490 Cable/Sa	
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud		0 Other			🗇 810 Selective	: Service
(I) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability D 371 Truth in Lending D 350 Motor Vehicle D 380 Other Personal		LABOR  O Fair Labor Standards		SECURITY		s/Commodities/
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage		Act	(7) 861 HIA ( (7) 862 Black		Exchange B75 Customer	
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability (7 385 Property Damage	c 🗇 72	0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations		2/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3	3410
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise		073	0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	□ 864 SSID		D 890 Other Stu	
REAL PROPERTY	lajury PRISONER PETITIO	NS Ø D 74	0 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (4	(L/TAX/SUITS	D 891 Agricultu	c Stabilization Act
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacai	tc 🖸 79	O Other Labor Litigation		(U.S. Plaintiff	4	mental Matters
220 Foreclosure	O 442 Employment Sentence	C) 79	1 Empl. Ret. Inc.		(fendant)	D 894 Energy A	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment     240 Torts to Land	O 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: Accommodations O 530 Gragal	ł	Security Act	0 871 lRS	-Third Party IC 7609	C3 895 Freedom Act	of Information
17 245 Tort Product Liability	O 444 Welfare O 535 Death Penalty	\$2000000 \$2000000	MMIGRATION		IC 1009		Fee Determination
[J 290 All Other Real Property	🗇 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 🔘 540 Mandamus & Ot	her 🗍 46	2 Naturalization Applicatio			Under Eq	qual Access
	Employment		3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee	i		to Justice	
	Other		5 Other Immigration			950 Constitut State Stat	
	(3 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions				
<b>気1</b> Original	ar "X" in One Box Only)  moved from		anoth	sferred from	6 Multidistr.     Litigation	ict 🗇 7 📈	ppeal to District age from lagistrate
			(5000	aly) al claintes nr	_	Ju	rdgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	City the U.S. Civil Statute under sybich you a	ac maig (	Do not the jurisdiction	iai statutes ui	mess diversity).		2
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A	ct					
VII. REQUESTED IN	EMAND S	CI	HECK YES only	if demanded in c	complaint:		
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMANDS CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23  JURY DEMAND: 2 Yes C No							
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER		
Explanation:							
5 m 1/1 - 1/							
<u> </u>	7/4 13/ UR	urg	1/WKKIM	ne/			
DATE	SIGNÁTURĘ O	FATTOR	ENEY OF RECORD				

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

I	David	A.	Mae	stas	:	CIVIL ACTION	
N	co Fin	vanc	iral S	yslems, Ir	oc.	NO.	
	plaintiff sh filing the c side of thi designation the plaintif	nall comous complaints form.  In that off and a	plete a C nt and ser ) In the lefendant ll other pa	ase Manageme we a copy on all event that a de shall, with its f arties, a Case M	nt Track Designation defendants. (See § efendant does not a Tirst appearance, su	duction Plan of this court, couns on Form in all civil cases at the tire 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reagree with the plaintiff regarding about to the clerk of court and ser Designation Form specifying the	me of verse said ve on
	SELECT	ONE O	F THE F	OLLOWING	CASE MANAGE	MENT TRACKS:	
	(a) Habcas	s Corpu	s – Cases	brought under	28 U.S.C. § 2241	through § 2255.	( )
	(b) Social and Hu	Security ıman Se	y – Cases ervices de	requesting rev nying plaintiff	iew of a decision o Social Security Be	f the Secretary of Health nefits.	( )
	(c) Arbitra	ition – (	Cases req	uired to be desi	gnated for arbitrati	on under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )
		os – Ca ire to as		ving claims for	personal injury or	property damage from	( )
	commo	only ref	erred to a ereverse	s complex and	that need special o	a) through (d) that are r intense management by planation of special	( )
	(f) Standa	rd Man	agement -	- Cases that do	not fall into any or	ne of the other tracks.	00
	5 J Date 215 5	7-11 540-8	8888	Gang Th Attorner 877-78	or Konmet y-at-law 88-2864	David A. Mo Attorney for Kimme Cordiflou	estos vicon
	Telephone	<u>:</u>		FAX Nu	ımber	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 2272 W. Harrold Ave Englusord, CO 80110					
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road, Harsham, PA POLIL)					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
(Use Reverse Side For Addi	tional Space)				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No No				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year p	previously terminated action in this court?				
	Yes O No C				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit action in this court?	pending or within one year previously terminated				
Eddin III and doute.	Yes□ No□				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier num					
terminated action in this court?	Yes No B				
	<b></b>				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights ca					
	Yes No No				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:     1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1.   Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2.   Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. © Antitrust					
	4. □ Marine Personal Injury				
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
	specify)				
7. Civil Rights	7. Products Liability				
8.  Habeas Corpus	8.  Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S. C. \$1692	(Please specify)				
(Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION					
(Check Appropriate Category)  I, rang Mackimmel, counsel of record do hereby certify:					
Dursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;  Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
	E-Trans				
DATE: 5-21-11 TRUTE NOT SEMME!	3 1100				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or with	hin one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
5.27-11 1 min 1 hordinal	5710 A				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (6/08)

### 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 2 3 DAVID A. MAESTAS, 4 Plaintiff 5 ٧. Case No.: 6 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR 7 JURY TRIAL Defendant 8 (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 COMPLAINT 10 DAVID A. MAESTAS ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 11 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 12 ("Defendant"): 13 14 15 INTRODUCTION 16 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 17 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 18 19 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 20 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 21 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 22 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 23 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 24 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of 25 Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.

- 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
- 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Englewood, Colorado, 80110.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters
   located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning on or around September 30, 2010 and continuing through November 2010, Defendant made continuous and repeated telephone calls to Plaintiff's place of employment in its attempts to collect a debt.
- 18. Plaintiff received phone calls and voicemail messages from Defendant on a number of occasions from the following phone number: (866) 473-8983, which the undersigned has confirmed is a phone number belonging to Defendant.
- 19. Defendant placed repeated calls to Plaintiff's work telephone almost every day, causing Plaintiff to receive, on average, at least two (2) collection calls a day, and at times, more than four (4) collection calls a day.
- 20. As a result, Plaintiff received at least ten (10) collection calls a week, and more than twenty (20) collection calls a month, to his work telephone from Defendant.
- 21. When calling Plaintiff at work, Defendant would dial other office extensions requesting to speak with Plaintiff, his supervisor, or payroll.
- 22. When Defendant did speak with Plaintiff, it threatened him that if he did not make payments on the alleged debt that it would garnish his wages.
- 23. Defendant deceptively claimed that it could garnish up to 50% of Plaintiff's income in an attempt to induce Plaintiff into making a payment on the alleged debt.

- 24. Also, Defendant claimed that if Plaintiff did not make payments on the alleged debt that it would pursue legal action against him.
- 25. Plaintiff advised Defendant that it was inconvenient for him to receive debt collection calls at work and instructed Defendant to stop contacting him at work.
  - 26. Defendant ignored Plaintiff's instructions and continued to contact him at work.
- 27. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiff at his place of employment on November 5, 2010, seeking and demanding payment on the alleged debt.
- 28. In addition to repeatedly contacting Plaintiff at work, Defendant also contacted Plaintiff's girlfriend in its attempts to collect a debt from Plaintiff.
- 29. To date, despite threats to the contrary, Defendant has not filed a lawsuit or taken other legal action against Plaintiff; thereby indicating Defendant did not intend to take the action it previously threatened at Plaintiff.
- 30. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

31. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u> 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

32. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

33. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

34. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
- Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
- c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- d. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
- e. Defendant violated §1692e(4) of the FDCPA by representing or implicating that the nonpayment of any debt will result in the garnishment of wages of any person when such action is not lawful and the debt collector does not intend to take such action;
- f. Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA by threatening to take action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken;
- g. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DAVID A. MAESTAS, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, DAVID A. MAESTAS, demands a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 5-27-11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

ву: <u>СТК 3654</u>

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com